

Spec. Coll.

FRANKLIN PIERCE

AND HIS

FREESOIL ALLIES.

WASHINGTON CITY,

July 27th, 1852.

Our attention was called to an article in the *Republic* of this date, relating to "Franklin Pierce and his Freesoil allies."

In order to enable us to answer numerous inquiries from our constituents and others, as to the truth of the charges against General Pierce, we have taken the pains to examine the several numbers of the N. H. Patriot, quoted from in the following article, relating to the course of General Pierce, Messrs. Norris, Hibbard, and Peaslee, Members of Congress from New Hampshire, at home. We have found the extracts correct on careful examination.

We have also examined the laws and resolutions of the State of New Hampshire, and find them correct as quoted.

WM. CULLOM,

Of Tennessee.

EDWARD STANLY,

Of North Carolina.

We annex the article from the *Republic* referred to in the foregoing certificate.

From the Republic.

In our issue of the 13th instant we copied two articles from the *Independent Democrat*, of Concord, New Hampshire, and the *Manchester (N. H.) Democrat*, in relation to General PIERCE's views on the question of slavery. These articles were published in Democratic newspapers before General PIERCE was thought of as a candidate for the Presidency. They were not written with any design of injuring him. They were not contradicted by him at the time, though one of them was published in his own town. They were not contradicted by any friend of his, or by any editor friendly to him.

Certain gentlemen in Congress from New Hampshire have attempted to deny the truth of these publications. Their denial shows undeniably that the surprise in the ranks of the Southern Democracy has alarmed General PIERCE's friends. Like MARTIN VAN BUREN, he is recommended as a Northern man with Southern principles. He is claimed by Secessionists to have been nominated by them. The Democratic ticket is claimed as one of their "creation and choice."

Anti-Slavery
E
430
.F8542
1852

General PIERCE's home-made speeches are relied upon to procure for him the support of Democratic Freesoilers. The VAN BURENS, PRESTON KINGS, RANTOULS, CLEVELANDS, and HALLETTs, are all wishing to abolish slavery wherever it exists in God's heritage, and all are earnest friends of PIERCE. Let us first see what the Democratic papers referred to said of PIERCE in January last:

From the Independent Democrat, published at Concord, New Hampshire.

At the meeting appointed at New Boston Centre on Friday afternoon of January 2, by General Franklin Pierce, to address the citizens of that town in regard to the difficulties between himself and a portion of the Democrats of that section, he occupied the hour of his in defending his military character. He explained the circumstances of his fainting, and declared that, "with the exception of a single occasion, he had led his command in the blaze of every battle."

After this he commenced speaking upon the Fugitive Slave law. He said that it differed in no important particular from the law of 1793. A clergyman who was present said that as the invitation had been given, he would like to make an inquiry: "Do you regard the features of the Fugitive Slave law as consistent with common law?"

General Pierce immediately replied: "*If I must answer the question, I say no, I do not. I have been asked if I liked this Fugitive Slave law. I answered no, I loathed it. I have a most revolting feeling at the giving up of a slave; the law is opposed to humanity.*"

Here Mr. Fogg inquired: "If it was not opposed to right as well as humanity?" General Pierce replied: "Yes, it is opposed to moral right."

The above is the substance of General Pierce's remarks upon the Fugitive Slave law. The quotation marks include the very language used by the General, as taken down at the time it was uttered.

The next piece of evidence which it is necessary in this connexion to republish is from the Manchester (N. H.) *Democrat* of January 8. It is in the form of a letter, dated New Boston, January 3, 1852. General PIERCE made a speech, and inquired if there was any revolutionary soldier present. The letter from the Manchester *Democrat* proceeds then in the following words:

Some one in the audience announced that Mr. Albert Hogg, a revolutionary soldier, (and in 1845 and '46 a member of the Legislature from New Boston,) was still living, but not present; and a second voice announced that he was a thorough Atwood man.

General Pierce.—"And none the worse for that."
Voice.—"So I think."

The General then proceeded to speak of his father and mother as riding horseback over rough roads, and of the great improvements that have been made within a few years. *He referred to the Constitution of the country, and in a pious train of thought recognised the higher law, and "that power above all constitutions." His position here was so unequivocal, that the Rev. Mr. Fogg, formerly a clergyman of this town, could but assent to it as sufficiently "fanatical" to satisfy the most ultra abolitionist.*

Mr. ATWOOD was the candidate of the Abolitionists in New Hampshire for the office of Governor. General PIERCE thought a man was "none the worse" for being a thorough Atwood man. He recognised the "higher law" when he was trying to conciliate Abolitionists!

Here is another extract from the Manchester *Democrat*:

After a few more exclamations in regard to saving the Union, and announcing the fact that in the late war "my own command and the Palmetto regiment stood together on the field of battle," the General again took up the Compromise measures, saying that the North got the kernel and the South the shell. He repeated what Mr. Ayer had stated before, "that the present Fugitive Slave law, about which so much noise is made, was in no particular different from the law of 1783, under which we had lived nearly sixty years."

Here Mr. Fogg said that, without interrupting the speaker, he wished to make an inquiry: "If in no particular different, why was it necessary to pass the present law?"

General Pierce replied that the old law could not be executed because its execution depended on the State courts. He also said something which was not fully understood about the law of 1793, as based partly on the common law.

He was then asked: "Was either the law of '93, or the present law, founded in any degree upon the common law?"

General Pierce.—"I can't go into a disquisition upon the common law."

The inquiry was then made: "Do you regard the features of the Fugitive Slave law as consistent with common law?"

General Pierce.—"Will, if I must answer, No I do not. I answer, no; I have a most revolting feeling at the giving up of a slave; the Fugitive Slave law is opposed to humanity. [Here some one inquired, 'Is it not opposed to right?'] Yes, it is opposed to moral right. But our fathers made the compact, and we must fulfil it. I say nothing of the humanity of it, nothing of the right of it."

Mr. PIERCE was willing to approve the Compromise measures because the North had got the "kernel and the South the shell?" He

had "revolting feelings at the giving up of a slave." Can we wonder that he has the cordial support of MARTIN VAN BUREN, RANTOUL, HALLETT, CLEVELAND, and PRESTON KING?

Of course the publication of these facts, with their collateral evidences, greatly disturbed the Secessionists who had nominated PIERCE, and it became necessary to present a contradiction, in one form or another. How was this done? By a publication in a late number of the *Union*, under the names of Mr. NORRIS, HARRY HIBBARD, and C. H. PEASLEE. Now, Mr. NORRIS is a Senator from New Hampshire, and Messrs. HIBBARD and PEASLEE are members of the House of Representatives. These gentlemen did not hear General PIERCE's speech; they content themselves with saying that the New Hampshire papers that publish the speech are "Abolition prints." In reality, however, this makes the testimony stronger, for surely an "Abolition print" would not, to injure PIERCE, publish that he denounced the Fugitive law, and said he "loathed" it. This was calculated to benefit him among the Abolition Democrats in New Hampshire. Then these three volunteer defenders of General PIERCE give also two letters—one from a Mr. B. F. AYER, dated Manchester, July 15, 1852, and the other from Mr. J. M. CAMPBELL, also dated Manchester, July 15, 1852. The substance of what the members of Congress, with Mr. AYER and Mr. CAMPBELL, state is, that the report of General PIERCE's speech in the *Democrat* and *Independent Democrat* is untrue, and that these papers are "Abolition journals."

Now let us try General PIERCE's friends by the same rule that they would apply to others. In 1848 it was expedient, for such politicians as Messrs. PIERCE, NORRIS, HIBBARD, and PEASLEE, to secure Abolition votes in New Hampshire. From a file of the New Hampshire *Patriot*—not called an "Abolition journal" by these gentlemen—it appears that in 1847 the Legislature of New Hampshire passed a series of resolutions on the subject of slavery. These were presented to the Senate

of the United States, and included the following:

SENATE—30th Congress, 1st Session. Miscellaneous No. 17.

Resolutions of the Legislature of New Hampshire in relation to Slavery.

December 20, 1847. Ordered to lie on the table, and be printed.

STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE.

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives in General Court convened, That we regard the institution of slavery as a moral, social, and political evil; and, as such, we deeply regret its existence, and are willing to concur in all reasonable and constitutional measures that may tend towards its removal; but we are unalterably opposed to all movements having for their avowed object, or probable effect, the dissolution of our National Union, or the violation of our National Constitution—a Constitution and Union which *must be preserved*, and which can be preserved only by a strict adherence to the solemn compromises which lie at its foundation.

Resolved, That in all territory which shall hereafter be added to or acquired by the United States, where slavery does not exist at the time of such addition or acquirement, neither slavery nor involuntary servitude, except for the punishment of crime, whereof the party has been duly convicted, ought ever to exist, but the same should ever remain free; and we are opposed to the extension of slavery over any such territory; and that we also approve the vote of our Senators and Representatives in Congress in favor of the Wilmot proviso.

Resolved, That our Senators in Congress be instructed, and our Representatives requested, by all expedient and constitutional means and measures, to sustain the principles herein above set forth.

MOSES NORRIS, Jr.,

Speaker of the House of Representatives.

HARRY HIBBARD,

President of the Senate.

Approved June 30, 1847.

JARED W. WILLIAMS, *Governor.*

A true copy. Attest:

THOMAS P. TREADWELL,
Secretary of State.

There were two other resolutions, already twice published in the *Republic*—one asserting that the slave States alone had power to legislate upon slavery within such States, and the other opposing all "unauthorized interference," as endangering the Union, &c. Now, if abolition journals are not worthy of belief, what shall be said of Messrs. NORRIS and HIBBARD, members of Congress, who supported the above resolutions at a time when some of the Southern States threatened to secede from the Union if the Wilmot proviso were adopted?

In the New Hampshire *Patriot*, the organ of PIERCE, NORRIS, HIBBARD, and PEASLEE—the organ of the Wilmot Proviso Democratic friends of the South—the names of those Democrats who voted for these resolutions are published. The New Hampshire *Patriot* says, “every man elected as a Democrat voted in favor of them;” and among the names of those who thus voted are AYER and CAMPBELL. Will the Wilmot Proviso Democrats, Messrs. NORRIS, HIBBARD, and PEASLEE—the men who advocate all constitutional means which may tend towards the removal of slavery—inform us if these are the same Mr. AYER and CAMPBELL who deny the correctness of the report of General PIERCE’s speech?

Let us examine the course pursued by the defenders of General PIERCE in the House of Representatives, as it appears in the Journals of that body. We begin with the 1st Session 31st Congress, page 210:

DECEMBER 31, 1849.—Mr. ROOT offered the following resolution:

“Resolved, That the Committee on Territories be instructed to report to the House, with as little delay as practicable, a bill or bills providing a territorial government or governments for all that part of the territory ceded to the United States by Mexico by the treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo lying eastward of the Sierra Nevada mountains, and prohibiting slavery therein”

Mr. ALEXANDER H. STEPHENS moved that the resolution be laid upon the table.

Decided in the negative—yeas 83, nays 101.

Among the nays are C. F. Cleveland, J. R. Giddings, HARRY HIBBARD of New Hampshire, Preston King, CHARLES H. PEASLEE of New Hampshire, J. M. Root, and David Wilmot.

On February 4, 1850, (page 452,) Mr. ROOT modified his resolution, by striking out “Sierra Nevada mountains,” and inserting the word “California;” whereupon Mr. VENABLE moved that the resolution be laid on the table. Among the nays are C. F. Cleveland, J. R. Giddings, HARRY HIBBARD, CHAS. H. PEASLEE, J. M. Root.

FEBRUARY 4, 1850, (page 454.)—Mr. GIDDINGS offered the following resolutions:

“Resolved, That we hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they

are endowed by their Creator with the certain inalienable right to life and liberty; and that governments are constituted for the purpose of maintaining these rights.

“Resolved, That in constituting governments in any territory of the United States, it is the duty of Congress to secure all the people thereof, of whatsoever complexion, in the enjoyment of the rights aforesaid.”

Mr. HARALSON, of Georgia, moved that the said resolutions be laid upon the table—yeas 103, nays 90.

Among the nays are C. F. Cleveland, J. R. Giddings, CHARLES H. PEASLEE of New Hampshire, J. M. Root, and David Wilmot.

In justice to Mr. PIERCE we quote a passage from one of his Congressional speeches upon this question as it is reported in the Appendix to the *Congressional Globe*, 25th Cong., 2d Sess., page 54:

“I have no hesitation in saying that I consider slavery a social and political evil, and most sincerely wish that it had no existence upon the face of the earth; but it is perfectly immaterial how it may be regarded either by you or myself; it is not for us to sit in judgment, and determine whether the rights secured to the different States by the Constitution are blessings or otherwise: it is sufficient for the argument that they are rights which the inhabitants do not choose to relinquish.”

It will be seen that, like others of his party from New Hampshire, Mr. PIERCE has, as RANTOUL said of HALLETT, “two systems.” In New Hampshire he is “loathing” slavery; in Washington city his views are more moderate.

We now turn to the home action of Mr. PIERCE’s political friends, and especially of those who have voluntarily assumed the responsibility of sponsors of Mr. PIERCE’s political faith. We think it can be made evident that the gentlemen who have gallantly rushed to Mr. PIERCE’s rescue themselves stand in urgent need of defence—that some of the most valiant railers in his behalf, as against the charges of the “infamous” Abolition and Democratic prints, may be supposed to be most at home in Freesoil company—and that the whole Democratic party of the Granite State are very unfit subjects for southern embraces.

The Democratic State Convention was held at Concord on the 11th of June, 1846. General PIERCE was one of the committee on reso-

lutions, and that body reported the following, among others which were unanimously adopted, after a speech in their favor by General PIERCE:

"Resolved, That we reaffirm the sentiments and opinions of the Democratic party and Democratic statesmen of the North, entertained from 1776 to the present day, in relation to slavery; that we deplore its existence, and regard it as a great moral and social evil; but, with this conviction, we do not deem ourselves more wise than Washington, Franklin, and their associates, and that patriotism, common honesty, and religious principle, alike bind us to a sacred observance of the compact made by those wise men."

The Democratic State Convention, held October, 15, 1846, reaffirmed the same resolutions.*

In 1847 the Legislature of New Hampshire, in both branches of which the Democrats had a decided majority, passed the resolutions which were published in the *Republic* on the 23d instant, declaring, among other things, that—

"We regard the institution of slavery as a moral, social, and political evil, and as such we deeply regret its existence, and are willing to concur in all reasonable and constitutional measures that may tend towards its removal."

A Democratic State Convention was held at Concord October 28, 1847, of which Hon. MOSES NORRIS, jr., (now a Senator) was President, and General C. H. PEASLEE (now a Representative in Congress) was one of the Committee on Resolutions. The committee reported the following, which was unanimously adopted:

"We declare it our solemn conviction, as the Democratic party have heretofore done, that neither slavery nor involuntary servitude should hereafter exist in any territory which may be acquired or annexed to the United States, and that we ap-

* (At the Democratic State Convention, Oct. 15th, 1846, Harry Hibbard was one of the Committee on Resolutions. At this Convention, Messrs. C. H. Peaslee and B. F. Hallett, of Boston, made speeches.

The vote in Congress of the Representatives of New Hampshire, in favor of the Wilmot proviso, approved.)

At the Convention of Oct. 15th, 1846, this resolution was adopted:

"Resolved, That we approve of the vote of our Representatives in Congress in favor of Mr. Wilmot's amendment to prohibit slaves in any territory that may be acquired in Mexico."

prove the votes of our delegation in Congress in favor of the Wilmot proviso."

At the second session of the New Hampshire Legislature in 1848—being still strongly Democratic in both branches—sundry resolutions were passed on the subject of slavery. One series, declaring the importance of preserving the territories free from slavery, was passed and approved December 29, 1848. On the next day, December 30th, on motion of J. L. HADLEY, since Democratic Secretary of State, a resolution passed both branches, and was approved, declaring that—

"We cordially approve of the vote of our Representatives in Congress, at the present session thereof, upon the subject of the slave trade in the District of Columbia, and request their concurrence in all such just and constitutional legislation as may be necessary to prevent all traffic in slaves therein."

Five days afterwards, namely, on January 4, 1849, a further declaration on the subject of slavery, contained in a new series of resolutions, was drawn up and introduced, (see *New Hampshire Patriot*, January 11, 1849,) by the Hon. HARRY HIBBARD, then President of the New Hampshire Senate, now a Representative in Congress. The adoption of the resolutions was moved by Mr. HIBBARD, then a candidate for Congress, who left the chair for that purpose; they were voted for by all the Democratic Senators, and were adopted. They were in the following language:

"Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives in General Court convened, That we are in favor of the passage of a law by Congress forever prohibiting slavery in New Mexico and California, and in all other territories now acquired, or hereafter to be acquired by the United States, in which slavery does not exist at the time of such acquisition.

"Resolved, That events have recently occurred and are now transpiring, at the seat of the General Government and elsewhere, which seem to make necessary a renewed expression of our views upon the subject.

"Resolved, That our Senators in Congress be instructed, and our Representatives be requested, to urge the passage of such a law in relation to New Mexico and California; and we approve, as we have always heretofore done, of all their votes already given in favor of such a law, or in favor of the principle of the same.

"Resolved, That the Secretary of State be directed to forward a copy of the foregoing resolutions to

each of our Senators and Representatives in Congress."

On the 28th of December, 1848, a Democratic Convention for the nomination of a member of Congress for the second Congressional district was held at Meredith Bridge, at which General CHARLES H. PEASLEE was put in nomination. That convention adopted the following resolution unanimously :

"Resolved, That they (the Democracy of this district) will never approve nor cease to oppose, by all proper and constitutional means, the extension of slavery to free Territories; that California and New Mexico being now legally free from slavery, it is the duty of our Government to allow, or cause it to continue so, as long and so far as it has any control over the matter; and our Representative in Congress is hereby requested to use his influence and exertions for the attainment of that object."

The Legislature of 1849 was also decidedly Democratic in both branches. A select committee was appointed in the House of Representatives, to whom were referred the report and resolutions of the Legislature of Virginia, and also certain resolutions of the Legislature of Missouri on the subject of fugitive slaves; together with a new law on that subject then pending before Congress. The committee made a report and recommended resolutions, both of which were adopted by the Legislature, approved by the Governor, and copies of the same sent to every State in the Union. The report is too long for insertion here; but, among other things, it contains the following in reference to the representations in the report from Virginia on the subject of fugitive slaves:

"That these pictures are drawn with more feeling than fidelity, and are the result of a distempered fancy rather than an impartial observation of facts, our knowledge of the orderly and law-observing character of non-slaveholding communities compel us to believe."

In regard to the new Fugitive Slave law, mentioned in the report from Virginia, the committee say: "The new legal remedy asked for by the report under consideration is, indeed, 'remarkable.' The committee then go on to state the specific demands in this "new legal remedy," and sum them up by saying that they

"Are claims so extraordinary—so insulting to

the free States—that they cannot have been advanced with any expectation of their meeting with the sanction of any State where a regard to the interests of slavery has not become paramount to every proper appreciation of State rights, and of the rights and security of freemen."

The committee conclude the report by recommending a series of resolutions, from which we select two :

"Resolved, That opposed to every form of oppression, the people of New Hampshire have ever viewed with deep regret the existence of slavery in this Union; that while they have steadfastly supported all sections in their constitutional rights, they have not only lamented its existence as a great social evil, but regarded it as fraught with danger to the peace and welfare of the nation.

"Resolved, That in our opinion Congress has the constitutional power to abolish the slave trade and slavery in the District of Columbia, and that our Senators in Congress be instructed, and our Representatives be requested, to take all constitutional measures to accomplish these objects."

The report and resolutions were adopted and approved by the Governor July 7, 1849.

We are not aware that the Democracy made any declaration in the Legislature of 1850 on the subject of slavery, but in an authoritative record of their State Convention, held on the 24th of October, 1850, at which, the editor of the New Hampshire Patriot says, "the utmost harmony and enthusiasm prevailed," we find the following as a part of one of the resolutions adopted:

"Resolved, That the holding of human beings in a state of bondage is a curse to any country; that we are opposed to slavery, black or white, in all its forms, and under whatever circumstances."

Leaving the more authentic source of New Hampshire Democratic profession at home, in the resolutions adopted by their Legislatures, with the approval of their Governors, and of their State Conventions, let us turn for a moment to the sentiments promulgated by the New Hampshire Patriot, the general organ of the New Hampshire Democracy, and the particular organ of General PIERCE.

The Patriot of the 16th of May, 1850, contains an editorial, making grievous complaints against the Independent Democrat, which the editor of the Patriot sets forth as follows, showing his views in regard to the Compromise measures:

["The last number of the *Independent Democrat* was unusually prolific in deliberate and malignant falsehoods. They are too numerous to mention and too palpable and barefaced to need refutation. For instance, it says that 'the *Patriot* is at last out in full blast for Foote's Compromise,' and that the *Patriot* of May 2d contained four articles 'in avowed advocacy of forming territorial governments without the Wilmot proviso.' Every reader of the *Patriot* will set these two assertions down as totally false in every particular. *Instead of having favored the Compromise plan which it names, we have published more against it than that paper has;* and instead of that number of the *Patriot* containing four articles in avowed advocacy of territorial governments without the proviso, it did not contain one."

In a leader in the same name number of the *Patriot*, the editor says that he does "not approve of this manner of settling the matter;" that the people of the State "desire to have slavery excluded from the Territories by positive enactment;" and that they go for this and so does their members of Congress.

The *Patriot* of August 22, 1850, after the series of measures now known as "the Compromise" had passed the Senate, but before the House had acted on them, used this language:

"The Compromise bill, as it was introduced, was far better; these same measures, as they stood in that bill, were less objectionable than they now are, inasmuch as a large extent of territory is given to Texas to become slave territory, which the Compromise gave to New Mexico to remain free territory."

In reference to the slave trade in the District of Columbia, the editor, in the same number, says:

"That it is admitted on all hands to be a disgrace to the nation, as it is most offensive and disgusting to every northern man."

In the *Patriot* of May 23, 1850, an article is quoted from the *Haverhill Republican*, the Democratic organ in the fourth Congressional district of New Hampshire, defending Mr. HIBBARD against a suspicion that he would "cave in" on the Wilmot proviso. The writer of the article, after expressing unshaken confidence in Mr. H., says

"Mr. Hibbard, unless he wishes to misrepresent his district, will carry out his own views and those of his constituents, by giving the *Wilmot proviso* a hearty support, whenever he has it in his power."

The editor of the *Patriot*, in his comments upon the article, says:

"We have no doubt that it speaks the sentiments of the great mass of the people of this State, and

points out correctly the course which our Democratic members will take."

Having thus brought together a multitude of evidences calculated to throw light on a subject which the Democratic organs are laboring to falsify, we are content for the present to leave the reader to decide whether it is preposterous, impossible, or even unlikely that General PIERCE, in his attempt in January last to retain his influence with the Atwood wing of his party, should have made remarks quite as anti-slavery in their tenor as those which are attributed to him in Mr. GOODALE's and Mr. FOGG's papers. It was not for the interest of Mr. GOODALE and Mr. FOGG, in the condition of their controversy at the time, to represent General PIERCE as being any more anti-slavery than he really was; and we have not a particle of doubt that they endeavored to represent him fairly. He is known always to have acted heartily with his party in New Hampshire, and we have proved incontestably that throughout the prolonged agitation of late years they have uniformly been found on the side of the Freesoilers, and against the South. General PIERCE did but echo the sentiments of his party in his own State when he launched his bitter denunciations against slavery and the Fugitive Slave law.

Since the foregoing was in type, the following affidavit has been received by the Editor of the *Republic*. Other testimony will be forthcoming. Mr. Foss, we understand, is a preacher of the Baptist persuasion, of excellent character and unimpeachable veracity:

I, Andrew T. Foss, of Manchester, in the county of Hillsborough, and State of New Hampshire, depose and say, that on the 2d day of January, 1852, I attended a political meeting at New Boston, in said county, which was addressed by General Franklin Pierce; that I went there for the purpose of reporting the speakers, and that the report of the speech of General Pierce, wherein he declares that he "loathed the fugitive slave law, &c.," was furnished by me to the editor of the *Manchester Democrat*—that the same was written out by

me on the evening after the meeting, from notes taken on the spot; and that the facts therein stated as published in said Manchester Democrat, and also in the Independent Democrat, are true. I distinctly recollect that General Pierce said, among other things, that he had a "most revolting feeling at the giving up of a slave," that he "loathed the fugitive slave law," and that the same "was opposed to humanity and moral right."

A. T. FOSS.

STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE,
Merrimack, ss. July 23, 1852.

Personally appeared, Andrew T. Foss, and made solemn oath that the above affidavit by him subscribed is true, before me,

JACOB S. HARVEY, J. P.

HERE IS A SHORT ACT WHICH MAY BE WORTHY OF THE NOTICE OF THE SOUTH.

"An act authorizing Edmund Brooke to remove to the District of Columbia two slaves, owned by him prior to his removal from Virginia :

"*Be it enacted, &c.*, That Edmund Brooke, of Georgetown, in the District of Columbia, be authorized, and permission is hereby granted him, to bring from the State of Virginia into the said District of Columbia two negro slaves, namely, John and Alfred, the property of the said Brooke, and to have and to exercise the same rights of property and of ownership over the said slaves as if they had been brought by the said Brooke into the said District at the time of his removal to the said District of Columbia, any law, custom, or usage to the contrary notwithstanding. This act shall be in force from its passage." Approved June 30, 1834. (Vide Little & Brown's private acts, p. 600.)

This bill came up in the House of Representatives June 12th, 1834, when Mr. Wardwell moved to lay it on the table, which failed, yeas 69, nays 95, FRANKLIN PIERCE voting in the affirmative, and thereupon the bill passed, yeas 106, nays 47, FRANKLIN PIERCE voting in the negative. (Vide H. Jour., 1st sess., 23d Cong., p. 743.)